

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Dent.

Dent discloses how a new base station transmits synchronization information on a high bit rate control channel and a low bit rate channel (col. 6, lines 15 to 40) to a mobile station, and by means of this synchronization information the mobile station can synchronize a pseudorandom key stream between the mobile station and the base station. This is described in column 6, lines 8 to 40, of Dent.

In contradistinction, in the present invention (as recited in the claims) it is stated that the key is transmitted in connection with handover, while according to Dent, column 6 lines 15 to 40, the mobile station searches for synchronization information from two different downlink channels. In the present invention the new base station broadcasts that encryption key information on a BCCH-channel.

The independent claims recite that information about the encryption key is transmitted in connection with the handover over a BCCH channel.

Since this is not in Dent, the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16 under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn. Further since there is not the slightest suggestion of these features in Dent, these claims are unobvious over it.

Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dent as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively above, and further in view of Kojima. Since these features are not in Kojima, the rejection of claims 6 and 14 under 35 USC 103 on Dent in view of Kojima should be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dent and further in view of Gilhousen. Similarly, Gilhousen fails to disclose these features. Thus the rejection of claims 7 and 15 under 35 USC 103 on Dent in view of Gilhousen should be withdrawn.

New claims 17 and 18 recite that encryption keys are frame specific and are generated at both ends of the transmission connections. Since this is totally missing from any of the references, these claims are patentable for this additional reason.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,


Henry I. Steckler

Reg. No. 24,139

Aug. 29, 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512